

file Roads

26 SEP 1983

Dear John:

Your point regarding participation in the study is well taken. My apologies for not being more sensitive to the Park Service equities. I will suggest to VDH&T that you be included in the initial review of alternatives. You will pardon us if we do not make a formal announcement of this since to do so would raise further debate from the more contentious citizens.

Route 193 is not included in the study because there is no possibility of increasing traffic capacity with the current law designating it a scenic byway. While safety improvements may be required, they are clearly a VDH&T responsibility that persists with or without our expansion.

Dealing with the traffic management issue has been the bane of our existence ever since we suggested it. The State and the citizens have both stated that they do not want to recognize this principle in road design. As Committee discussion has shown, there is an irreconcilable issue between those who plan and those who implement and live with the results. For that reason, I do not want to delay progress any further to debate what is a regional planning issue of major proportion. Our agreement with VDH&T states that they will go only to the point of making recommendations with respect to the Parkway. They will then back out and let the Federal Government pursue actual improvements. I would appreciate it if you could live with the current approach until the recommendations are made. If, in your opinion, a further study is required to account for TM, we would agree to work with you and FHWA to achieve a solution you could live with.

Despite what some of the citizens would like the community to think, we are trying to solve the traffic issue in everyone's best interest. As you now know, this is a difficult task in the face of all the factionalism and cross-currents regarding traffic planning and its impacts. If we can come up with a set of improvements that the community, VDH&T, and the Park Service can accept and which the Agency can justify to its Committees, then we should be in contention for the Nobel. Anything you can do to help us get in that position is greatly appreciated.

I have no objection to your finalizing your draft as you see fit. If you are interested in taking a strong position on the traffic management issue, then I would suggest addressing the letter to Harry Fitzwater.

Regards,



STAT

DRAFT

United States Department of the Interior

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
 GEORGE WASHINGTON MEMORIAL PARKWAY
 C/O TURKEY RUN PARK
 McLEAN, VIRGINIA 22101

IN REPLY REFER TO:

SEP 20 1992

STAT

New Building Project Office
 Central Intelligence Agency
 Washington, D.C. 20505

STAT

Dear [redacted]

I was pleased to review the draft scope of services outline for the CIA Access Improvement Study prepared by the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation. I would like to provide comments on this draft scope.

I note that the Existing Access Network and Alternatives Identified and Selected for Evaluation are to be accessed for compatibility with CIA and VDH&T objectives and requirements, however, no analysis is provided for a similar assessment of compatibility with National Park Service objectives and requirements. A need to protect the utility and scenic quality of the parkway for the millions of motorists that use it each year should be recognized and effects accessed.

It appears that the only role proposed for the National Park Service in the study process is as a member of the Advisory Committee. Since we manage one of the principal roadways being evaluated (VDH&T manages the others) it would seem that our role should be strengthened.

Virginia 193 is presently used by CIA employees. I question why improvements to this road have not been identified for possible evaluation.

I would like to again identify our strong reservations about not evaluating traffic management alternatives along with construction alternatives. If the CIA plans to change present work schedules in such a manner that the presently experienced peak loading will significantly change in the future, and if the CIA Access Improvement Study wrongly assumes that the present schedules will be followed, then the conclusions drawn from the study will be inaccurate. If traffic management alternatives are not considered, I do not see how the National Park Service, the National Capital Planning Commission or the U.S. Congress can properly access the needs for federally funded improvements on Federal parkland. I reject the notion that traffic management alternatives cannot be considered because they conflict with VDH&T policy. It could very well be that VDH&T develops its recommendations and makes its decisions based on construction alternatives only; however, our recommendations can only be

DRAFT

developed after evaluating the traffic realities that will exist with the proposed Traffic Management Plan in place.

We will continue to make improvements to the GWMP/CIA Interchange and plan for future improvements there. The present interchange bridge redecking project will be completed this fall at a cost of over \$330,000. We have directed the Federal Highway Administration to continue planning on the westbound access ramp improvements and this project is expected to cost between one-half and three-quarters of a million dollars. A copy of the latest study on the interchange improvements is enclosed.

We are committed to work closely with you in the development of transportation improvements that will further the national interests of your Agency and the National Park Service while also recognizing and ameliorating direct negative impacts to State and local values. I believe that the results of this study, that your Agency has initiated, will lead to the accomplishment of needed improvements that will provide direct and real benefits to the McLean community, the State road system in this area, and will also benefit the users of the George Washington Memorial Parkway.

Sincerely,

John F. Byrne
Superintendent

Enclosure